1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Taveres, et al. v Duren Hogan Construction, et al.

## 1. <u>JURISDICTION AND SERVICE</u>

The basis for the Court's subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims is the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.*, as alleged in the Complaint. There are no existing issues regarding personal jurisdiction or venue. There are no parties that remain to be served.

## 2. <u>FACTS</u>

Plaintiffs assert that he and they were employed to work on numerous public works construction projects which are funded in part by public funds of local municipalities or state of California. While these projects are subject to prevailing wage laws and the corresponding rates of pay, Defendants failed to pay the Plaintiffs the required prevailing wage rate and failed to pay Plaintiffs the required overtime rate for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day or and 40 hours a week.

Plaintiffs seek unpaid overtime wages, unpaid prevailing wages which also impact the regular rate for overtime work, "waiting time penalties" under California Labor Code § 203 for failure to pay employees all wages due at the time of termination. Plaintiffs also seek restitution under California Business and Professions Code § 17200.

The principal factual issues in dispute are:

- 1. Whether the time records maintained by Defendants accurately reflect the actual number of hours worked by Plaintiffs;
- 2. Whether and to what extent Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiffs their wages;

## 3. <u>LEGAL ISSUES</u>

Plaintiffs assert that Defendants failed to pay them overtime pay in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants field to pay them the prevailing wage in violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1815. Plaintiffs further alleges that Defendants failed to provide adequate paystubs and submitted false certified payroll records in violation of California Labor Code § 226, § 1174 and § 1176. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to pay their wages upon termination in violation of California

2 **C08-1277 HRL** 

## CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

Taveres, et al. v Duren Hogan Construction, et al.

1

3

2

45

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

2223

23

25

CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

Taveres, et al. v Duren Hogan Construction, et al.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

13. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR ALL PURPOSES

Both parties consent to proceed before a magistrate judge for all purpose, including a trial.

14. OTHER REFERENCES

Parties do not believe this case is suitable for a binding arbitration and will not agree to any other reference.

15. <u>NARROWING OF ISSUES</u>

N/A

16. EXPEDITED SCHEDULE

N/A

17. SCHEDULING

Parties submit the following schedule to this Court in relation to discovery, motions, designation of experts, and pretrial conference and trial:

- (a) Fact discovery cutoff on February 28, 2009;
- (b) Expert reports March 31, 2009;
- (c) Expert rebuttal reports April 30, 2009;
- (d) Expert Discovery Cutoff May 31, 2009;
- (e) Last day of hearing on dispositive motion on June 17, 2009;
- (f) Trial starts July 20, 2009
- (g) The parties agree to meet and confer concerning any modifications to this plan.

18. TRIAL

Both parties have requested a jury trial. The expected length of trial is 3-5 court days.

19. <u>DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS</u>

Plaintiffs have no person to disclose other than themselves.

20. OTHER MATTERS

N/A.

4 **C08-1277 HRL** 

CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

Taveres, et al. v Duren Hogan Construction, et al.

1	DATED: July 3, 2008	By: <u>/s/ Adam Wang</u> ADAM WANG	
2		ADAM WANG Attorneys for Plaintiff	
3			
4	DATED: July 6, 2008	By: /s/ Paul Simpson	<u>.</u>
5		Paul Simpson Attorney for Defendants	
6		·	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22 23			
23 24			
24 25			
۷۵			
	CACE MANIA CENTENTO CO A CO	5 ENGENIE	C08-1277 HRL
	CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT  Taveres, et al. v Duren Hogan Construction, et al.		